Case 3:12-cr-003 Of PERSTAPES UDIS THE EDECK P5/17/12 Page 1 of 1

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR (2-0501 ((215
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Lypia Rinc	FILED
MINIA 10100	MAY 1 7 2012
Defendant.	
Speedy Trial Act from May 17, 2012 to the continuance outweigh the best interest o	rd on many 2012, the Court explained by the lighter the property of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i	yould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	inplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	rould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	rould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. v).
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. v).
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 5/17/12	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney